





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,643	08/30/2001	Louis Benoit	P21366	7042
7055 7:	590 06/19/2003			
	M & BERNSTEIN, P	.L.C.	EXAMINER	
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			PHAN, HAU VAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3618	
			DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
u ·		BENOIT, LOUIS
Advisory Action	09/941,643	
	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAN INC DATE of this communication of	Hau V Phan	3618
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		7
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on 4/18/2003. Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) \(\subseteq\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	⊠ will be entered and an w or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-6,13-18 and 20-27</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-12 and 28-30</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	ر (s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ر	
10. Other:		dimo
HP 6/17/63	SUPFAVISORY PALENT &	AMINER 6/17/
6/17/63	TECHNOLOGY CENTER	3600 /o?

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The final rejection of claims 7-12 are still proper, in response to application's argument that the frame of Myers is not made by pressing, instead, it is made by extrusion. In contrast, the frame of MacDonnell is made with punches and dies. Persons skilled in the art would not employ a pressing technique in a frame that is initially made by extrusion. The examiner disagrees, because Myers discloses the frame can be formed by other suitable manufacturing processes (col. 5, lines 62-65). Therefore, person skilled in the art would be able to combine the frame of MacDonnell into the frame of Myers.